



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

no one solution will meet all needs; but we welcome this clear and frank discussion of the problem, and shall look forward to the author's further, more constructive efforts in the book he announces on *The Gospel and the Modern Man*.

FRANK C. PORTER.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

RECENT BOOKS ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL

The problem of the gospel of John, like the problem of Jesus himself, will not down. Interest in it fluctuates, or at least the manifestation of interest shown in published books and articles varies, and the line of battle advances and recedes; but the sun never sets upon an ended contest. Recent months have, as Sanday in his opening lecture remarks, produced a remarkable series of discussions on the subject, articles or books having appeared from Schmiedel, Loisy, Jülicher, Réville, Bacon, Stanton, Drummond. To these Sanday's own volume adds another of first-rate importance, to which there has still later been added the article by Professor Carl Clemen in the October number of the *American Journal of Theology*. These discussions make it evident that, for the moment at least, the tendency to narrow the space between opposing opinions has been checked and reversed; the apostolic influence upon the gospel and the degree of historicity are again being minimized, and the gap between diverse opinions widened. The discussion of the problem is therefore no threshing over of old straw, but eminently opportune.

The present volume¹ bears the familiar marks that are characteristic of all Canon Sanday's work: learning, clearness, fairness to opponents, judiciousness in judgment, conservatism. Yet Sanday's conservatism consists, not in a strenuous adherence to traditional views, but rather in a frankly expressed preference for those views which on the one hand are consistent with the evidence as he interprets it, and on the other involve no serious departure from those conceptions for which the historic church has for centuries stood.

The book has its limitations, mainly such as are imposed by the occasion which gave rise to it. It consists of eight lectures delivered before Union Seminary, New York, in October and November, 1904. In the nature of the case, such lectures could not enter into minute discussion of detailed evidence. In some matters, accordingly, notably in respect to

¹ *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*. Eight Lectures on the Morse Foundation, delivered in the Union Seminary, New York, in October and November, 1904. By William Sanday. New York: Scribner, 1905. xiv + 268 pages. \$1.75 net.

the external evidence, the book, in marked contrast to the recent essays of Professor Bacon and Professor Clemen, does not so much recite and weigh the evidence, as give us Sanday's verdict respecting the value of it. But even at these points the reader is persuaded that he is listening to the verdict, not of a partisan, but of a judge.

The book as a whole is an able defense of the view that the gospel is from an eyewitness of the events, a companion and disciple of Jesus, probably John the son of Zebedee, though Sanday does not wholly exclude, but even shows some leaning toward, the possibility that the author was a younger John, not of the Twelve, but a follower and beloved friend of Jesus. He strongly insists that the book is not a biography, but a gospel, and admits that the material has undergone a considerable degree of transformation in the mind of the writer since he witnessed the deeds and heard the words of Jesus. He finds, however, no room for redactor and editor save in 21:24, 25, and no occasion to admit intentional, or serious unintentional, misrepresentation of the history. He denies that the book shows any large influence of Paul upon the theology of its author, and holds that the essential elements of the Christology and the germinal trinitarianism of the book were derived from Jesus himself.

Granting, what the present reviewer at least is disposed to grant, that the author's judgment respecting the external evidence, which he states rather than substantiates, is sound, Sanday's discussion as a whole may fairly be said to show that he who is able to believe that Jesus wrought miracles such as this gospel records, or that he did things which a personal companion of Jesus would have described as these things are described, and that Jesus could have said such things respecting his own relation to God as the gospel reports him as saying, or that he could have said those which in the process of sixty years of reflection could have become transformed in the mind of his disciple into the sayings as here reported, should have no difficulty in accepting this gospel as coming, in substantially its present form, from the hand of a personal companion of Jesus. Whether this companion of Jesus was John the apostle, or another younger John outside the apostolic circle, but not outside that of Jesus' personal disciples, is relatively unimportant. The decision of the main question really turns upon the amount and kind of evidence demanded to sustain such a proposition. Shall we, as Sanday indicates on p. 183, reason from the historical evidence to the authorship, undeterred by the difficulty of regarding these events and teachings as historically belonging to Jesus, and then, on the basis of authorship, accept them as historical? Or shall we, on the basis of the difficulty of believing them to be historical, set our standard for the

kind and amount of evidence necessary to prove eyewitness-authorship, and then, if the evidence fails to meet the demands of this standard, declare the eyewitness-authorship disproved? In fact, nobody does the former consistently; we all do—Sanday by no means least—determine more or less definitely the kind and character of evidence necessary to establish a certain conclusion, and then determine our verdict according as the obtainable evidence meets or fails to meet this demand. One's verdict on the authorship of the fourth gospel will be in no small measure fixed in advance by the canons of evidence that are adopted.

Thus once more we are forced to recognize that criticism and philosophy, however often divorced in courts of church or of reason, refuse to live apart, and that in this alliance criticism eventually bends the knee to philosophy. The ideal of a criticism unbiased by philosophy is an ideal, not to be relinquished, but, in the last analysis, impossible of perfect achievement. When we press our critical question to a final answer, we cannot escape weighing our evidence in scales that our philosophy constructs.

In the meantime Sanday's book is instructive and helpful. Its criticism of the recent literature is informing and discriminating. Its arguments are almost without exception fair and reasonable. If it does not enter fully enough into some matters—such, for example, as the external testimony and the evidences of editorial work—to enable one from this work alone to judge of the case on its merits, the author has at least clearly defined his own point of view, and enabled us to see how from that point of view the matters appear to a sober and fair-minded man.

ERNEST D. BURTON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

This book² is the first part of a work covering the Johannine vocabulary and the Johannine grammar. The grammar is soon to be published. The two volumes are introductory to a third on *The Fourfold Gospel*. But they are also a continuation of *Diatessarica*, under which name four volumes have been published, viz.: *Clue: A Guide Through Greek to Hebrew*, *The Corrections of Mark*, *From Letter to Spirit*, and *Paradosis*. It appears, then, that the present volume on *Johannine Vocabulary* is the fifth of a work which will ultimately consist of seven volumes, unless indeed *The Fourfold Gospel* shall be found to have one or more successors.

The volume before us treats, first, of Johannine "Key-Words" (146 pages); second, of "Johannine and Synoptic Disagreement" (91 pages);

² *Johannine Vocabulary: A Comparison of the Words of the Fourth Gospel with Those of the Three*. By Edwin A. Abbott. London: Black, 1905. xviii + 364 pages. 13s. 6d.

and, finally, of "Johannine and Synoptic Agreement" (112 pages). In addition to these main divisions, we have an "Introduction" (15 pages) and an appendix on "Prepositions in the Four Gospels" (5 pages). The motto of the book is *oratio imago animi*, and it is dedicated to the author's daughter, "by whom the main materials for the work were collected and classified, and the results corrected and revised." It may not be incorrect, therefore, to regard the *Johannine Vocabulary* as the first critical contribution by a woman to the problem of the origin of the gospels. But we infer from the dedication that all the interpretative matter of the volume, including a multitude of footnotes, is to be credited to Dr. Abbott himself.

The purpose of the *Johannine Vocabulary*, if we may deduce a statement of this from sec. 1442 of the Introduction, is to illustrate the Johannine use of synonymous words, also of characteristic iterations and variations; to illustrate the Johannine use of different forms of the same word; to illustrate the subtle shade of meaning denoted by slight variations of a clause; and finally—though this belongs, at least in part, to *Johannine Grammar*—to illustrate one of John's most striking characteristics, his frequent obscurity or ambiguity.

The first of the three main divisions of the book, that on "Key-Words," has a chapter on "Believing," a chapter on "Authority," and a chapter on "Synonyms." The first of these, from the nature of the case, is the most extensive. "Few of the leading characters," as the author says, "are not placed at some time in such circumstances as to show us—or make us ask—what, or whom, and how, and why, they 'believed'; or why, and what, and whom, they were exhorted to believe." In this chapter on "Believing" the author discusses the usage of the Old Testament, of Philo, and of the New Testament exclusive of John; then, the antecedent probability that a Christian at the close of the first century might be expected to restate the doctrine of believing; and finally takes up in order all the passages of the gospel of John in which any form of the word occurs. His conclusion is that "believing is to be regarded, according to John, in different aspects, not as a consummation, or a goal, but as a number of different stages, by which different individuals pass, in accord with their several individualities, toward the one center, Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God, in whom they are to have life."

We may illustrate the character of the discussion by the author's treatment of the expressions "trusting to the name of," and "trusting to," the Lord, though this is one of the relatively few instances in which we cannot wholly agree with his views. Dr. Abbott approves of Origen's distinction, and holds that "trusting in the name of Jesus implies a lower kind of trust,

a profession of belief in baptism, which professed belief, if not followed up by spiritual action, might come to nothing" (sec. 1487). Again, referring to John 2:23, "Now when he was in Jerusalem at the passover, during the feast, many believed on his name, beholding his signs which he did," the author says: "This probably implies that they were baptized in Christ's name" (sec. 1493). He thinks the statement of John 3:22 antecedently probable, that Jesus, or rather his disciples, continued the work of baptizing. But does it follow that, because Jesus allowed his disciples to baptize in the land of Judea, after he had virtually been rejected in Jerusalem, therefore he had baptized previously? And does it follow that, if he allowed his disciples to baptize, the baptism was "in Christ's name"? What could it possibly have meant at that time, either to Jesus or to the public, that disciples were baptized in his name? But the chief objections to this distinction between trusting to the name of Jesus, and trusting to him, are (1) the significant use of the word "name" in John (see, e. g., John 14:13; 17:6, 11, 12; 20:31), and (2) the context of the passage in which "believing in the name" first occurs (John 1:12). Those who believe on Christ's name are spoken of as those who "received him," who also were born "of God." This latter qualification seems to imply that John, in this instance at least, meant by believing in the name of Christ a sincere trust. And we are not to abandon this position because of the expression "to them gave he the right to become children of God," as though they were not yet his children. If "born" of him, they are his spiritual children; and by the right to become children of God (*γενέσθαι*) John can have meant only the authority to claim all the privileges pertaining to this new relationship to God. Nor ought we to admit that John 2:23 obliges us to alter our interpretation of John 1:12, 13. The many to whom Jesus did not trust himself, though they professed to believe in his name, certainly had no true and deep faith; but we cannot believe that the author wished to indicate this by saying that they "believed on his name." In John 8:31 it is said that certain Jews "believed him" (*πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ*), and yet, a little later, the same people took up stones to stone him (John 8:59). They evidently had no true faith in him, though it is said that they "believed him."

In the chapter on "Authority" in the fourth gospel our author's view may be indicated in a sentence or two. "According to John, human authority at its highest implies perpetual and voluntary dependence upon divine will" (sec. 1580); "If life is to be laid down with authority, it must be laid down out of love for others" (sec. 1588); and, "The false ruler says to the true, 'I have authority to take thy life'; the true ruler replies, 'I have authority to lay it down'" (sec. 1594).

The chapter on "Johannine Synonyms" treats of "seeing," "hearing," "knowing," "coming," "worshiping," and "going away," and contains many valuable suggestions. An interesting argument is presented for taking the words of John 4:22 away from Jesus, and giving them to the Samaritan woman, who here "mimics the dogmatism of the Jewish rabbis" (secs. 1647, 1648). In sec. 1629*a*, which refers to John 17:25, "O righteous Father, the world knew thee not, but I knew thee," the author asks: "Does this mean (1) that the pre-incarnate Son recognized the Father from the beginning, or (2) that the incarnate Son recognized the Spirit of the Father when he was baptized and sent forth to preach the gospel?" But, we ask, *must* it mean one or the other of these views? Is there not even a third explanation possible, not to go farther than that? May we not better understand the passage in this way: Jesus was looking back over his ministry as a completed whole (aorist). During that ministry he, in contrast to the world, had known the Father. The aorist doubtless *might* refer to an act of the pre-incarnate Son, but such a reference would require some clear evidence not furnished by this passage. The other alternative—viz., that the words refer to Christ's recognition of the Spirit of the Father at his baptism—hardly does justice to the manifest fact of his constant abiding in the Father. Moreover, the knowledge which came to Jesus in the hour of his baptism was knowledge of his own mission rather than knowledge of the character of God.

The six word-lists which are designed to illustrate the Johannine vocabulary by comparison of its words with one or more of the synoptists are more than mere lists of words. Introductions and footnotes give so much of the context and use of a word that the statistics have real significance. Many interesting facts are pointed out which illustrate the allusiveness of John; nor does the author limit his allusions to the synoptists or even to the New Testament writings. Thus, e. g., in the stress which John lays on the fact that the Son does all things "for the sake of the Father," or "for the sake of the disciples," the author sees an allusion to the doctrine of Epictetus: "Whatever lives has been so framed as to do all things *for its own sake*."

As specimens of Johannine allusion to passages in the synoptists we may note John 8:12: "I am the light of the world," which is thought to allude to Matthew's "corruption" of the doctrine of Christ when he represents him as saying, "Ye are the light of the world" (Matt. 5:14); and John 20:17: "Jesus saith unto her, 'Touch me not,'" which is thought to be a correction of Matthew's statement that certain women took hold of the feet of the risen one (Matt. 28:9).

In concluding this brief review of *Johannine Vocabulary*, I will quote from the Introduction two sections which seem to indicate in an admirable manner the most striking qualities of the volume. They concern the famous dialogue in the appendix of John's gospel, which has caused all translators a good deal of trouble. The rendering and comment of Dr. Abbott are as follows:

Jesus. Simon, son of John, *lovest* thou me more than these?

Peter. Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I *still love* these.

Jesus. Feed my lambs.

The Master now repeats his question on a lower level, dropping the clause "more than these."

Jesus. Simon, son of John, *lovest* thou me?

Peter. Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I *still love* thee.

Jesus. Tend my young sheep.

On the third occasion, Jesus comes down to a yet lower level, to the standard that the humiliated disciple has himself adopted.

Jesus. Simon, son of John, *lovest* thou me *still*?

Peter. Lord, thou knowest all things, thou *feelest* that I *love* thee *still*.

Jesus. Feed my young sheep.

Thus, the dialogue resolves itself into a short dramatic poem with a triple refrain, apparently alluding to traditions mentioned in other gospels, but not in this one. Most simple, yet most beautiful, artless yet in harmony with the deepest laws of art, it combines a passionate affection with subtle play on words and a most gentle yet powerful suggestion of loving reproach and helpful precept.

GEORGE H. GILBERT.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

In his essay³ on the death of the sons of Zebedee, E. Schwartz starts with an assumption which, while learnedly fortified by plausible reasonings, is so palpably a mere assumption as to vitiate the entire argument. To the request of the sons of Zebedee for seats one on the right hand and the other on the left of Jesus in his glory, and to their assurance that they could drink of the cup of which he drank and could be baptized with the baptism with which he was baptized, Jesus had replied: "The cup that I drink of ye shall drink; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized" (Mark 10:39). This utterance, ascribed to Jesus, Schwartz understands as a *vaticinium ex eventu*; the cup and baptism mean the martyr's death which both James and John suffered; the prophecy was written and laid in the mouth of Jesus after the occurrence; and since James was put to death by Herod Agrippa in 43 A. D., John also must

³ *Ueber den Tod der Söhne Zebedaei: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Johannes-evangeliums.* Von E. Schwartz. Berlin: Weidmann, 1904. 53 pages. M. 3.50.

have met death at the same time (Acts 12:2). John's name was suppressed because of a legend that he still lived in Ephesus. According to this theory, the John mentioned by Papias cannot be the son of Zebedee, but was John Mark, who had become one of the "pillars" of the church at Jerusalem (Gal. 2:9), but did not accompany Paul and Barnabas on the first missionary journey, as erroneously reported in the book of Acts. The gospel, the epistles, and the Apocalypse were not written by the son of Zebedee, but a hundred years after his death, by some unknown person, who, though elsewhere skilfully disguising it, once disclosed his hand, in the last chapter of the fourth gospel, and there, in correcting the false interpretation that the son of Zebedee should not die, really indicates that John is already dead and enjoys only the life which an immortal spirit has. Of this whole essay one may say that it is interesting and evinces learning, but is not convincing.

ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY.

COBB DIVINITY SCHOOL,
Lewiston, Me.

SOME OTHER BOOKS ON JESUS AND THE GOSPELS

M. Jacquier's history of the synoptic gospels,¹ while offering no new theory and working out no new solution of the problems which are perplexing scholars, is an admirable review of the gospels themselves from the modern literary point of view, and of the criticism to which they have been subjected. After giving the meaning and use of the term "gospel," and the testimony of antiquity to the existence and relation of our present synoptics, M. Jacquier discusses the contents and characteristics of the oral gospel, analyzes critically and comparatively the three written gospels as we now have them, then describes the theories of their origin which have been advanced, and finally deals with each gospel in detail, its language, date, place of composition, author, readers, teachings, and history. For his own conclusions he maintains that at the basis of the synoptics is an oral gospel, or catechism, in Aramaic, which became written in many forms, more or less complete; that Matthew's logia and Mark's fuller narrative were the main sources of both Matthew's and Luke's gospels, as we now have them, but were supplemented by other apostolic narratives, oral as well as written. Our Greek Matthew he would date before 70 A. D., Mark between 64 and 67 A. D., and Luke in the decade 60 to 70 A. D.

¹ *Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament*. Tome second: *Les évangiles synoptiques*. Par E. Jacquier. Paris: Lecoqfré, 1905. xii+511 pages. Fr. 3.50.